



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,870	09/08/2003	Erich Drobek	1454.1485	8106
21171 7590 04/04/2008 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER LE, KAREN L	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/04/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/656,870

**Applicant(s)**

DROBEK, ERICH

**Examiner**

KAREN L. LE

**Art Unit**

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-4 and 6-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-4 and 6-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-20 are allowed.
2. Claims 20-29 are pending in the application for examination, wherein claim 21, being independent.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman (US Pat No. 5,884,032) et al in view of Funck et al (US 2003/0097339).

Regarding claims 21- 23, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches a method for managing data in automatic call distribution system, comprising

Determining caller data to identify a caller (Col. 9, lines 30-32)

providing the agent with the customer data document through the agent workstation (see figs 1-3; and col. 6, lns 1 – 60).

Extracting customer data from a customer database on the basis of the caller data (Col. 9, lines 30-32)

Bateman does not teach formatting a portion of the customer data to create a customer data document based on an agent security level, the agent security level identifying types of information within the customer data to which a call answering agent is permitted access. However Funck teaches access level is selected from a plurality of graded access rights, during a booking-in process of an agent and /or an agent workstation, an agent profile is activated, which identifies previously-specified access rights to customer information, and the customer data document is generated from the customer data by matching access rights to the activated agent profile (paragraphs 0031, 0032 and 0033). Funck teaches depending upon the vendor with whom the customer is dealing, the customer may have differing levels of security. For example, three levels of security may exist for a particular vendor code, namely a first, second and a third security levels. If the customer computer receives a vendor code corresponding to the first security level, which means that the vendor is a highly trusted vendor, then all of the customer data may be extracted and transmitted to the agent of

the ACD. If the vendor code corresponds to the third security level, only very limited information may be extracted and transmitted to the agent. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Funck's feature into Bateman's system in order to format a portion of the customer data to create a customer data document based on an agent security level, the agent security level identifying types of information within the customer data to which a call answering agent is permitted access. Presentation of the customer data to the agent based on security level is notoriously old and well known.

Regarding claim 24, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein an access address is assigned to the customer data document, which address refers to an area of a working memory occupied by the customer data document, and the access address of the customer data document is transmitted to the agent workstation (see figs 1-3; and col. 6, lns 1 – 60).

Regarding claim 25, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the customer data document is buffer stored in a working data memory, the working data memory is independent of the customer database, and the agent workstation accesses the customer data document from the working data memory (see figs 1-3; and col. 6, lns 1 – 60).

Regarding claim 26, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein the customer data document is created in a markup

language, and the agent is provided with the customer data document from the agent workstation by a browser for the markup language (see figs 1-3; and col. 6, lns 1-60).

Regarding claim 27, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches the method in accordance with claim 6, wherein the customer data document is created as an HTML document, and the browser is an HTML browser (see figs 1-3; and col. 6, lns 1 – 60).

Regarding claim 28, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches the method in accordance with claim 5, wherein the customer data document is created as a HTML document, the working data memory is a web server, a URL address is assigned to the HTML document, and the URL address is transmitted to the agent workstation to provide the agent with the customer data document (see figs 1-3; and col. 6, lns 1 – 60).

Regarding claim 29, referring to figures 1-3, Bateman teaches The method in accordance with claim 7, wherein a URL address is permanently assigned to the agent workstation, the customer data document created as an HTML document is stored in a server assigned to the agent workstation, the server has an "update" function, the "update" function is triggered by a connection of a caller to the agent workstation, and the customer data document is opened by triggering the "update" function (see Col.5, lines 54-67).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 12, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to Applicant's remarks, Applicant mainly argues that Bateman and Funck do not teach formating a portion of the customer data to create a customer data document based on an agent security level, the agent security level identifying types of information within the customer data to which a call answering agent is permitted access. Examiner respectfully disagrees since as shown in paragraph 0031 and 0034, Funck teaches a customer data processor stores and processes customer data based on predetermined security level to each vendor and presents the customer data to the agents of each vendor. For the above reasons, Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection based on Bateman and Funck for supporting the Examiner's Final Action.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen L. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7487. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon and Thurs: 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Karen L Le/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2614

March 29, 2008

/Ahmad F. MATAR/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614